



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/875,321 | 06/06/2001 | Rory A.J. Curtis | 10448-061001 / MPI2000-25 | 7512 |
| 7590 12/17/2003 | | | EXAMINER | |
| INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP MILLENNIUM PHARMACEUTICALS INC. | | | PAK, MICHAEL D | |
| 75 SIDNEY STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1646 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 09/875,321 | CURTIS, RORY A.J. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| The | WALL INC. DATE: | Michael Pak | 1646 | | | | |
| Period for Repl | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Respo | nsive to communication(s) filed on 03 No | vember 2003. | | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This a | ction is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This a | oction is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-11 and 13-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Application Pap | | oloolion requirement. | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. | | | | | | | |
| 3) 🔀 Information Dis | closure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 6) | | | | | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Offi PTOL-326 (Rev. 11-03) | | on Summary | Part of Paper No. 12102003 | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I filed on 3 November 2003 is acknowledged.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: pages 3-5 of the specification contains blank underlined spaces which should be filled in or deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The claims are directed to a polynucleotide encoding potassium channel and vectors comprising the polynucleotide. The specification on page 1 disclose the asserted utility of using the protein for determining pharmacological properties.

However, there is no nexus between the claimed protein and the therapeutics for humans. The specification as filed does not disclose or provide evidence that points to a property of the claimed protein such that another non-asserted utility would be well established. The polypeptide lacks substantial utility because further research to

Art Unit: 1646

identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. Thus, the asserted utility lacks substantial and specific utility because further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. Brenner V. Manson 383 U.S. 519, 535-536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) stated that "Congress intended that no patents be granted on an chemical compound whose sole "utility" consists of its potential role as an object of use-testing ... a patent is not a hunting license." Brenner further states that "It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." Any utility of the nucleic acid encoding the protein or other specific asserted utility is directly dependent on the function of the protein. A circular assertion of utility is created where the utility of the protein is needed to break out the circular assertion of utility. The polypeptides do not substantial utility because the skilled artisan would need to prepare, isolate, and analyze the protein in order to determine its functional nexus with human therapeutics. Therefore, the invention is not in readily available form. Instead, further experimentation of the protein itself would be required before it could be used. The disclosed use for the nucleic acid molecule of the claimed invention is generally applicable to any nucleic acid and therefore is not particular to the nucleic acid sequence claimed. The claims directed to vectors and host cells do not have utility because the nucleic acid without utility is needed to practice the inventions.

Claims 1-7 and 12 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 3-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 recite or encompass the term "hybridizes under stringent conditions" or "hybridizes" which is ambiguous because it is a relative term and it not clear what is the metes and bounds of the claimed nucleotide. Claims 2-7 and 12 are dependent on claim 1.

4. Claims 1, 3-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 12 encompass an isolated nucleic acid encoding variants and fragments of proteins without functional limitations. However, the essential feature of the invention is the nucleic acid molecule which encodes a potassium channel subunit

of SEQ ID NO:2, and one of skilled in the art cannot envision the full genus of molecules of the claimed variant nucleic acid molecules. The claims encompass nucleic acid molecule encoding variants whose structure is not known or nucleic acid molecules encoding other variant proteins with different function from SEQ ID NO:2 taught in the specification. Claimed nucleic acid encoding protein variants encompass a large genus of proteins or channels which are alleles or variants whose function has yet to be identified from different species of animal because the structure of the newly identified naturally occurring protein is not known. *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* (CAFC) 43 USPQ2d 1398 held that a generic claim to human or mammalian when only the rat protein sequence was disclosed did not have written description in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 3-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adelman (WO 98/11139).

Adelman et al. discloses nucleic acid encoding a potassium channel which is 99.8% best local similarity to the claimed nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO:2. Adelman et al. discloses vectors and host cells and method of making recombinant protein using the host cell.

- 6. No claims are allowed.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564.

Art Unit: 1646

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

Hichar D. Mrc Michael Pak

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1646

10 December 2003